

All Posts

Subdeacon Nektarios, M.A.  
2 hours ago · 7 min read

# The Delusion of the "Resist Within" Movement: How Metropolitan Tychikos Became Another Example

**Introduction by Subdeacon Nektarios, Article by Dimitris Chatzinikolaou,  
Former Assistant Professor of the University of Ioannina**

---

## Introduction

Again and again, we have seen these conservative New Calendarists play the role of confessing clergymen against the hyper-ecumenist pseudo-hierarchs to whom they pledge fealty—even while simultaneously rejecting them as heretics for their continued involvement in the ecumenical movement.

Take, for example, Father Theodore Zisis, the well-known non-commemorator of Greece. He broke communion with his heretical bishop years ago due to his local church's persistent involvement in ecumenism. Despite this, he has never been tried or deposed—because his spineless hierarchs know full well that he is more theologically competent than they are.

Another example is Father Matthew Vulcanescu, the recent non-commemorator in England, who broke communion with his hierarchy in the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of the U.K. on the grounds that they are practicing ecumenists and remain in communion with the ecumenically condemned Monophysites—due to a 1991 eucharistic agreement signed by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch. Strangely—one might say idiotically—he still claims to be a priest of that same Patriarchate, despite his open rejection of its heresies and his subsequent deposition by it.

Then there is the YouTube "Geronda" and crown jewel of the "resist from within" movement, Father Peter Heers. Without bishop or jurisdiction, he openly admits that all the Patriarchates have been compromised by the pan-heresy of Ecumenism in some way, that the Council of Crete (to which most of them submit) is thoroughly heretical, and that their membership in the World Council of Churches is also heretical. Yet, in spite of all this, he continually urges the laity to resist from within—fighting their own shepherds to change—because, according to him, leaving makes one "irrelevant" and "out of the fight."

So, we have one non-commemorator suspended indefinitely without trial; another defrocked by a jurisdiction he paradoxically still claims to belong to; and a third permanently without a bishop or canonical home—rendered irrelevant to the actual fight against ecumenism—all because the World Orthodox Patriarchates are governed by entrenched ecumenists and perennialists who could not care less what these pseudo-confessors say or do.

In the most recent case, we see Metropolitan Tychikos of Paphos, who, because of his "traditionalism," was first removed from his cathedral and then deposed from his office by the heretical Synod of the Church of Cyprus. Like others before him, he was punished for rocking the boat and disturbing the status quo of "do as we say—or else."

But what makes his case worse than the rest is that he submitted. He accepted the slanders against him—that he had introduced some kind of heresy—while at the same time defending those who accused him. Already I can hear the cries from the "resist from within" crowd, comparing him to Saint Nektarios, who quietly accepted unjust persecution. But let's be clear: Saint Nektarios was never charged with heresy, nor was he deposed for it, or at all. Metropolitan Tychikos, on the other hand, appears to have been removed specifically under that accusation and for other 'crimes' of traditionalism against his heretical synod.

In Tychikos's case, we see him first appeal to his own heretical synod, then to the arch-heresiarch of Constantinople—who, by any measure, is worse than his own synod—and finally releasing a public statement acknowledging that Canon 15 exists *precisely* for this kind of situation. Yet he then argues that those who invoke it without being “divinely illuminated” are schismatics, and ultimately submits to the synod's decision.

Let's be clear: I believe what they did to him personally was entirely wrong—though not unexpected, coming from a council of World Orthodox Judases who, in truth, care nothing for the doctrinal purity of the Orthodox faith. However, his response epitomizes the definition of *milquetoast* and serves as yet another example of why the “resist from within” movement is pointless, ineffective, “removes you from the struggle against ecumenism,” and—most importantly—is both anti-scriptural and anti-patristic.

---

### **Article by Dimitris Chatzinikolaou Concerning the Confession**

In the “Confession of Faith,” which Bishop Tychikos submitted to the “Holy Synod of the Church of Cyprus,” he easily allows it to be understood that he is against walling off because, supposedly, the two conditions set by the 15th Canon of the First-Second Council under Photios the Great (861) for walling off prior to a Pan-Orthodox synodal judgment do not exist, namely: (1) that Ecumenism is supposedly not being preached with boldness and publicly, and (2) that it is supposedly not a heresy already condemned by Synods or Fathers! He himself, moreover, adds a third condition, implying that the Fathers of the First-Second Council failed to point it out, namely: (3) that the decision for someone to wall himself off or not from heresy presupposes “divine illumination”! That is, whoever is thinking about walling off must first ask himself whether he possesses “divine illumination,” and proceed to walling off only if he answers this question in the affirmative!

As for the first condition, namely, whether Ecumenism is being preached or not officially, loudly, and on a global level, in both deeds and words, I ask Mr. Tychikos and all those who rejoiced over this “Confession of Faith”:

- 1) Have the Ecumenists anathematized the Patriarchal Encyclical of 1920 and the participation of the Orthodox Church as an equal member in the “World Council of Churches” (W.C.C.), accepting that by Herself She is not complete and that only in Her union with the hundreds of heretical “churches” will She become complete (“Toronto Statement,” 1950), thereby rejecting—indirectly yet clearly—the Symbol of Faith, which states that the Church of Christ, the Orthodox Church, is One?
- 2) Have they anathematized the common prayers and concelebrations with heretics, the union agreements with the Monophysites (Chambésy, 1991) and the Papists (Balamand, 1993)?
- 3) Have they anathematized the “lifting” of the schism of 1054, which they officially carried out on December 7, 1965? [...] and the New York Times of December 8, 1965, which states that “the state of non-communion is abolished,” that is, the schism is lifted.
- 4) Have they anathematized the pseudo-council of Kolymbari [Council of Crete] (2016), by which they recognized the aforementioned pseudo-churches “by their historical name,” such as, for example, Papism as the “Catholic Church,” whereas such is the name and identity of the Orthodox Church?

5) Have they anathematized the anti-Christian declarations, as well as those who made them, such as, for example, the statement that the “outdated Greek garments” must be abolished—that is, the doctrines of the Trinity of God, of His Incarnation, etc.—and replaced with new ones that are more believable to modern man? (Iakovos “of America,” New York Times, September 25, 1967, p. 40); that Christ did not have sinlessness from the beginning, but acquired it (Stylianios “of Australia,” periodical of the Holy Archdiocese of Australia Voice of Orthodoxy, vol. 9, no. 12, Dec. 1988); that “in the holy mosques, God is worshipped through the Koran” (Theodoros “of Alexandria,” 2020); that the Koran is “holy” (Bartholomew, 2005); that all religions are different “paths” leading to God (Athenagoras, Bartholomew, Elpidophoros, etc.), thereby insulting indirectly yet clearly Christ Himself as a liar and deceiver, He Who taught that He is the only Way by which man may reach God (John 14:6)? And thousands of other such things. Have they anathematized any of these, Mr. Tychikos? Surely not! So then, does the first condition for walling off exist or not?

As for the second “condition,” namely whether Ecumenism has been recognized and condemned as heresy by Synods or Fathers, I ask Mr. Tychikos:

1. Is he unaware of the anathemas of Ecumenical Councils against individual heretical doctrines of Ecumenism?
2. Is he unaware of the anathema against Ecumenism by the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad under Saint Philaret (ROCORA, 1983), as well as the anathema by the Old Calendar [GOC] Synod (1998)?
3. Is he unaware of the recognition of Ecumenism as heresy—or rather as a “pan-heresy”—by contemporary saints and Fathers, such as Saint Chrysostomos of Florina (+1955), Saint John Maximovitch (+1966), Saint Justin Popovich (+1979), and many other Orthodox theologians?

So then, Mr. Tychikos, does the second condition for walling off exist or not? As for the third “condition,” namely whether the one who is faced with the dilemma of walling off or not possesses “divine illumination”—a condition which, of course, the said holy Canon does not mention—I believe this is a deceitful addition, reminiscent of “Morphou,” who has stated that walling off is for the few, such as Fr. T. Zisis, who “knows the boundaries”! However, for someone to conclude about himself that he possesses “divine illumination” is a sign that he is already deluded and therefore the Ecumenists will “be right” in labeling the “wallers-off” [sic] as deluded and possessed of luciferian pride!

But the Lord enlightens all those of good will who have a pure heart to discern the true shepherd from the stranger:

## Back to Top

Orthodox Traditionalist Publications, LLC, © 2025

unskined snepnera, and accepts raise glory as if it were true; for what communion has light with darkness? (Patrologia Graeca, or in brief, P.G., 26, p. 1321). Therefore, Mr. Tychikos, even the third “condition” which you arbitrarily added to the Canon does, in fact, exist.

In conclusion, your condemnation of walling off in the “Confession of Faith” which you submitted to the Ecumenists, Mr. Tychikos, is erroneous. Unfortunately, in this way you lead to damnation (according to St. Athanasius the Great, as just mentioned) also those who thereafter decide to remain in communion with the pan-heresy of the Ecumenists. “For Chrysostom has declared with a loud and mighty voice that the enemies of God are not only the heretics, but also those who commune with them” (St. Theodore the Studite, P.G. 99, p. 1049). May you have good repentance.



Met Tychikos Confession of Faith.pdf  
Download PDF • 90KB

